



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|

69/419856 10/19/99 MAPLES ET AL 2696

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

U. K. RAJGURU

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1711

7

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Edward J. Cabic (Attorney) (3) U. K. Rajguru (Examiner)
(2) Samuel Acquah (SPE) (4)

Date of interview Mar 27, 2001

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Newly proposed replacement claims 17-36.

Agreement ☒ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached.

Claims discussed: Claims 18-15 in particular

Identification of prior art discussed: Scholz et al (USP 5749948) used in prior art.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Cabic explained the background of instant invention and also highlighted some areas in the declaration by T. Johnson already filed on Jul 21, 2000. It was agreed that Scholz fails to render instant claims obvious. A response from the Attorney would follow.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Samuel Acquah

Examiner's Signature

U. K. Rajguru